

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಉದ್ಭವ ವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ನಿರ್ದಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದೇವೇ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿಯದಾಗಿದೆ, ಇಲ್ಲರುವುದು ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನ ಕೆರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಿ. ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾತ್ರ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎಸ್. ಶಂಕರಪ್ಪ.—ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಕೆರೆಗಳು ಆ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮಟ್ಟದ ನಲ್ಲಿ ರಕ್ಷೆ ವಿದೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಆಂಕು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರು ಎಂಬ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರಿಯಿಂದ ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಲ್. ನರಸಿಂಹಯ್ಯ.—ಕೆಲವು ಮೇಜರು ಕೆರೆಗಳೂ ಪಿ. ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಿಂದ ಪಿ. ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಕೆರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರವಿದೆ, ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಲ್. ನರಸಿಂಹಯ್ಯ.—ಇಂತಿಂಹ ಕೆರೆಗಳು ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇಂತಿಂಹ ಕೆರೆಗಳು ಪಿ. ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು. ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರಗಂಜಿಗಳಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

MR. SPEAKER.—The question may be right, but it does not arise from this question.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—May I know whether the Government are contemplating carrying out a survey of these minor tanks and restoring them on a planned basis?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—It is not quite necessary to conduct a survey. Government have now instructed the officers—the local Assistant Engineer—to prepare *suo motu* a list of tanks that require to be repaired. The list will go through the proper channels and reach the Chief Engineer, who will prepare an overall plan and submit to Government every year on a planned basis, the number of tanks to be repaired in each district. Therefore, there is no need for a separate survey to be undertaken.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—Is the Government in a position to tell the amount necessary to carry out these restorations and repairs?

MR. SPEAKER.—That is a different question altogether.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—As I already submitted, Government have issued instructions to the officers

to prepare a plan and a list of tanks to be repaired. That is being done. When the plan is received, the estimates would perhaps be made.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—May I know if Government have instructed the officers to prepare estimates also when preparing the list of tanks that require repairs?

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೆರೆಗಳು ರಿಪೇರಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಡೆ ರಿಪೇರಿಯಾಗಿವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಪೂರ್ಣಿಯಾದ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಚೀಫ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು ಆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಕೆರೆಗಳು ನಾದು ರಸ್ತಾದಾಗ ಫಸಲು ಹಾಳಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಿರುವ ಕಡೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಏನಾದರೂ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದೆಯೇ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದು ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—1957-58ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೆ ನರು ಕೆರೆಗಳನ್ನು ರೆಸ್ಟೋರು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಅದನ್ನು ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ಟಿ ನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ತೋರಿಸಿದೆ, ಅಷ್ಟು ನೋಡಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ರೇವಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಐದಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ತುಂಬು ಒಪ್ಪಂದವಾಗಿರುವ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕೆರೆಗಳಿವೆ ರೂ ಅಪ್ರೋಂದೂ ರಿಪೇರಿ ಆಗದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಸರಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Construction of a Pravasi Mandir at Arakere, Srirangapatna Taluk.

Q.—630. Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether it is a fact that the District Board of Mandya called for tenders for constructing a Pravasi Mandir at Arakere, Srirangapatna Taluk;

(b) if so when;

(c) whether the land required for the Pravasi Mandir had been acquired and possession taken by them;

(d) whether it is a fact that a local contractor offered his good offices to take possession of the land and proceed with the construction of the Pravasi Mandir in case his tender was preferred?

A.—Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal affairs) [on behalf of **SRI R. CHENNIGARAMIAH** (Minister for Local Self-Government)].—

(a) Yes.

(b) On 10th September 1956 and 15th April 1957.

(c) Acquisition proceedings are under progress. The District Board, Mandya, has taken possession of the site.

(d) No.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know the estimated cost of these buildings?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The estimated cost of the main building is . . .

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. May I know the special privilege of the Cabinet Ministers to be absent from the House for any length of time? I find that the Minister for Local Self-Government has been absent for a number of days now when the Assembly has been in session and some colleague of his has been entrusted with the work of replying to his questions. Is it in order for the Minister to be absent like this?

Mr. SPEAKER.—A Minister cannot absent himself purposely, but if he is ill or has an urgent business, he can absent himself and instruct his colleagues to conduct the business on his behalf. The Hon'ble Minister Sri Chennigaramiah has informed me that he is not keeping well and so he has authorised his colleague Sri Baliga to act on his behalf.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, I was answering the question that the cost of the main building was about Rs. 15,363 and of the out-house about Rs. 8,146.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know the number of tenders received and the amount of the lowest tender on 10th September 1956?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Four contractors tendered and the lowest tender is for Rs. 13,910-10-0.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it for both the main house and the out-house?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—That is for the main building. For the outhouse it is Rs. 7,216-15-0.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know the number of tenders received on 15th April 1957 and also the lowest tender?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Tenders were called for on 15th April 1957 and the receipt of the tenders was on 27th May 1957. Two tenders were received. The lowest is for Rs. 15,110-44 nP for the main building and Rs. 8,078-28 nP for the out-house.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—What was the special difficulty in accepting the lowest tender that was received on 10th September 1956?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—By that time the site had not been finalised.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—What was the special hurry for the authorities to call for tenders when the site was not taken possession of?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The eagerness of the people and the desire of the Government to accommodate as far as possible.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am rather surprised. My question is this. The site was not taken possession of by the authorities. When that was the case why did they think of calling for tenders?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I would request the Hon'ble Member to bear in mind the difference between the two ideas. One is selecting the site and the other is taking possession of the site. By the time the tenders were invited the site had not been finalised.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Why were the tenders called for a second time?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I have answered that by saying that it was on account of the eagerness and the desire on the part of Government to finish the work as early as possible.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—The answer is not to the point. My question is what necessitated calling for tenders for the second time?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The site had been finalised by that time and now possession has been taken.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know whether the tenders called for the second time have been accepted?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I do not find that any tender has been accepted, but possession has been taken.

(SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA)
and land acquisition proceedings are in progress and the amount has been deposited by the Land Acquisition Officer.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Shall I presume that the authorities were not able to take possession of the site because one of the tenders was in possession of the site and he refused to give possession because his was not the lowest and there was no chance of his tender being accepted?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I have already replied that the site has been handed over to the District Board through the revenue authorities with the consent of the party.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Did the first tenderer also apply at the second time when tenders were called for in 1957?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—From the names I find that one is a common person in both the lists.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—My question is whether the first tender of 1956 also finds a place in the list of tenderers in 1957?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I cannot understand what is meant by 'first tenderer'. Is it first in the list or the last in the list. The last name in the first list does not appear in the second list.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—May I know how the District Board, Mandya, could take possession of the site when land acquisition proceedings were still in progress?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—My friend as a learned lawyer should know that possession can be taken by consent of the parties keeping the question of finalisation of the proposal for compensation to be decided by the court.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is it the practice of Government or the local authorities in land acquisition proceedings to take possession of the site even though the acquisition proceedings have not terminated?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—If possession can be got without recourse to force or the provisions of land, that is the best thing to do. Where consent

is not given and if it is necessary to take possession of the site, then there are provisions under the law by which possession can be taken even without finalisation of the amount of compensation that is to be given.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—May I know in whose possession the site was and also the common name that is found in the two lists of tenderers?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Possession was taken with the consent of the *hidolidars* and the persons who are entitled to hold the property. With regard to the name, I would seek the protection of the Speaker and say that the name may not be directed to be disclosed.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I seek the protection of the Chair. I want to know what special embarrassment would be caused to Government by placing the necessary information on the table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How is the Hon'ble Member entitled to know the names? Facts may be revealed. How are the names relevant here? It is in the interests of the House and the Hon'ble Members to avoid names.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—If I have understood the procedure of this House, the Speaker has given a ruling that wherever third parties are involved and if it is detrimental to their interests if the names are disclosed then such names should not be disclosed, but here I am unable to understand how anybody's interests are prejudiced by disclosing the names of the *hidolidars* and the tenderers.

2 P. M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Of course, where no such defamation or injurious affirmations are involved in the case of outsiders, names may be disclosed here. But I would request the Hon'ble Member not to insist on names because names are not of much importance at all. After all, there may be a landholder. The Hon'ble Member may ask questions about the landholder or about the Contractor. How he is in any way interested in knowing names?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Then I ask the Hon'ble Minister whether disclosing the name would lead to defamation?

Mr. SPEAKER.—How is he interested in the names?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The way in which answers are given leads one to doubt as to why names have been withheld.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The question is a general one and it does not deal with names.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—If no tender has been accepted, then where is the harm in disclosing the name of tenderer?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why does the Hon'ble Member want the name of the tenderer?

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Is it not a fact that the list of tenders is already published in the Executive Engineer's Office? When that is exhibited in the Executive Engineer's Office, why should not the Government disclose the information here?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point is, if the Hon'ble Members get information outside, in what way are the Hon'ble Members interested in knowing the names here?

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—It is an information published in the Government Office, no less than the office of the Executive Engineer.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In that case, the Hon'ble Member may take notice of it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—There is some justification for knowing the name of the person. The Hon'ble Minister was trying to suggest that as a result of agreement between the District Board and the concerned Hiduvalidar, the land was now taken over by the District Board. In view of the controversy, one is entitled to know as to who that person is.

Mr. SPEAKER.—At least members should not be so curious. Facts may be elicited.

Sri N. RACHIAH.—I rise to a point of order. You were pleased to say that so long as the fact was furnished by the Government, the Hon'ble Members need not worry. But I want to know

whether the names are apart from the facts of the case.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The facts are in no way affected by the names. I am following the principle that no names should be disclosed where defamation is likely to be committed or injurious affirmations are going to be made in the case of outsiders. In other cases where the disclosure of the names is innocent, I have no objection.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—May I know why the Government is feeling shy to disclose the names?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, there is no shyness; there is no diffidence at all. The very question (d), whether it is a fact that a local contractor offered his good offices to take possession of the land and proceed with the construction of the Pravasi Mandir in case his tender was preferred, seems to suggest that there is some little local politics. So, it is not desirable that Government should participate in any such local disputes.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Rule 26 pertains to conditions of admissibility of questions.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I regret very much for the reflections cast by the Minister. There is absolutely no local affair here, as can be seen. In the first tender the lowest is Rs. 13,000; in the second tender it is Rs. 15,000. The House is entitled to know how the Government have gone on in this affair and how the authorities have gone on in this affair.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I am sorry if the Hon'ble Member has understood in that light. I can assure him that the whole House and particularly myself hold him in such high esteem. There is no motive at all attached for questions put by him.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to submit, particularly in regard to the disclosure of names, that rule 26 makes it very clear that members which may ask questions eliciting information do not involve any defamatory matter. This is a matter of public importance and we are dealing with public affairs and very often the Chair has been reluctant to permit the Government to give out names. Unless this House

(SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA) comes to know who are all the parties involved, it will be rather difficult for us to know whether things are carried on in a straight way or whether there is any politics or manoeuvring. Here is a case where two tenders have been called for, one during 10th September 1956 and Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say at that time the possession of the site was taken. It is not common practice to call for tenders unless the entire arrangement is made pucca. Now again they have called for tenders and that tender goes up to nearly Rs. 23,000. So, naturally, members will be inclined to know what is exactly the relationship between the officers concerned and the man who is in possession of the property and also the tenderers. Therefore the non-disclosure of the names will naturally create an impression in our minds that there must be something fishy about it. Therefore, in the interest of clearing the doubts that may be in the minds of the members, it is necessary to disclose the names. I now ask a question Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must give a ruling on this.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—May I submit that there appears to be a little mixing up of ideas because I have never said anything about the acceptance of tenders. The question is with regard to the persons who have tendered and not with regard to the names of persons whose tenders have been accepted. The papers before me are not complete because possession has just been given and acceptance of tender is not yet over according to the papers before me. There is nothing to say that there is anything fishy or to say that other interests are involved.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I draw the attention of Hon'ble Members to Rule 26 (2) (d) which says:

“it shall not bring in any name or statement not strictly necessary to make the question intelligible.”

So, as far as I can see names of those persons who have given tenders is not necessary to make the question intelligible. That is why I have not allowed it.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is strictly necessary when we deem it to be necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not strictly necessary to make the question intelligible. Of course, Hon'ble Members may ask why a higher tender have been accepted, if at all they have been accepted and what is the relation between the person who has given the tender and the President of the District Board or like that.

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SETTY.—Without knowing the name how it is possible to ask a question?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is possible to ask.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಅಂದಾಜು ಮಂಜೂರು ಆಗದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಪುನಃಪ್ರಸಂಗ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಚಿಂಡರ್ಸ್ ಕರೆಯುವುದು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಕೋಡಿಗೆ ವ್ಯತಿರಿಕ್ತವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I require notice. I do not have the information just now.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಹದಿನೆಂಟು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಚಿಂಡರ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರಿಗೂ ಜಮೀನುದಾರರಿಗೂ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿದೆಯೇ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I am unable to answer it at present.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—That is exactly the difficulty. Unless we know the name, it is very difficult.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even if the name is disclosed, how is it going to help you? You will have the satisfaction of knowing the name, that is all.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is for us to determine to put a question; it is for the Chair to rule it out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not here to rule out everything.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—May I know whether the two tenderers are different—for the main building and the out-house?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—No, Sir the last tender for both is the same.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The Minister was pleased to say that possession was not taken when tender was first issued or asked for. At least, will the Government tell us the extent that was sought to be extended and was a blue-print prepared at all in this matter?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, I will require notice for that.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know whether the person from whom possession was taken is the very same person that has tendered and he is also the person who has given his tender for the first and second time?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, the names are not just before me now. If the Hon'ble Member is very keen, I shall get them.

Loans granted by the Central Mortgage Bank in the State.

Q.—1124. Sri S. R. RAMAIAH (Hoskote).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the amount of loans granted by the Central Land Mortgage Bank

to each Taluk in the Mysore State;

(b) the reasons for not advancing any loans to the Land Mortgage Co-operative Society in Devanahalli Taluka in spite of a large number of applications still awaiting disposal?

A.—Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—

(a) *Vide* statement appended below.

(b) Necessary action is being taken to grant loans to the extent possible in deserving cases. Total number of applications received during 1956-57 were only nineteen.

Statement showing the amounts of loans granted by the Mysore Central Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank Ltd., for each taluka in the New Mysore State from inception up to the end of 1956-57.

Sl.No.	Name of L.M.C.S.	Total sanctions	
		No. of cases	Amount
	<i>I. Bangalore District</i>		Rs.
1	Bangalore ...	98	3,91,005
2	Devanahalli ...	40	66,550
3	Hosakote ...	61	1,44,975
4	Channapatna ...	35	80,230
5	Ramanagar ...	22	47,900
6	Anekal ...	98	1,63,865
7	Nelamangala ...	47	1,05,270
8	Doddaballapur ...	88	1,53,945
9	Magadi ...	201	3,93,900
10	Kanakapura ...	14	41,490
	<i>II. Tumkur District</i>		
11	Tumkur ...	214	2,81,050
12	Kunigal ...	124	2,70,625
13	Chikkanaikanahalli ...	303	4,99,020
14	Gubbi ...	111	2,13,515
15	Madhugiri ...	129	2,66,980
16	Koratagere ...	39	58,235
17	Tiptur ...	365	6,37,555
18	Turuvekere ...	443	8,74,065
19	Sira ...	100	2,13,150
20	Pavagada ...	121	2,59,085